

Appl. No. 09 / 973,537
Comm. Dated March 29th, 2006
Reply To Office action of March 17th, 2006

Remarks / Arguments

Report of the amendments to the claims

- In claim 9 the formality has been corrected (semi-colon replaced with a dot at the end of claim, I hope the markings are clear enough).
- The dependent claim 14 and independent claim 24 have been amended to make the alternative (b) to be more accurate.
- The independent claim 26 has been amended to be more accurate.
- All other claims are as previously presented.

Patentability arguments

Arguments for the claims 14 and 24

I apologize if the connection to subject matter was not clear enough, the claim text now says for the alternative (b): "switching the referred packet to the appropriate output port according to a certain property assigned for the referred packet in the referring packet". The alternative (b) in claims 14 and 24 is based on the subject matter of the second last paragraph in the detailed description section, and figure 14, also claimed in the claims 22 and 26. The only difference in the claims 14 and 24 is that the reference is made to one packet instead of multiple packets. The information in the referring packet assigns a certain property for the referred packet, what is unambiguously disclosed in the related subject matter.

Quotations from the related paragraph:

*The node computers optionally deliver data packets according to a system, wherein in the header or other section of a packet is written occurrence information about the delivery addresses or other properties of the subsequent packets in the packet train containing said packet (refer fig. 14).
...Said occurrence information tells how many and / or what packets have certain or certain type of intermediate or final delivery addresses, or other properties. Said occurrence information appoints the packets to which it refers by a certain pattern or algorithm according to which said packets are picked from said packet train.
...Said occurrence information is used in said delivery address prediction method to predict intermediate or final delivery addresses of packets, or independently with or without said delivery address prediction method for switching as many packets as possible without reading their delivery addresses.*

Conclusion:

The amended claims 14 and 24 have unambiguous connection to the subject matter and fulfill all conditions of patentability.

RFST AVAILARIE CNDV

Arguments for the claim 26

The claim text now says: "a node computer receiving said informant packet and using its information to distinguish said dispersed packets and to have a custom processing for them, like for example switching said dispersed packets to appropriate output port(s) according to instructions given in said informant packet". The claim text is amended to remove any ambiguities concerning the "special treatment", the object is to have custom processing for the referred dispersed packets (custom processing is conventionally perceived utility of a useful patentable invention), like switching them to appropriate output ports according to instructions given in the informant packet.

Conclusion:

The claim 26 has been amended to clearly and properly describe a patentable invention, and to have a clear connection to the subject matter, so it fulfills all conditions of patentability.

.....